

App. No.: 10/065312
Filed: October 2, 2002
Conf. No.: 7690

RECEIVED Page 6 of 6
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 11 2003

OFFICIAL

REMARKS

The objection to the specification and drawings is noted and well taken. The problem, however, does not require a drawing correction but has been resolved by the foregoing amendment to the specification.

Turning now to the claims, the indicated allowability of claims 17-19, subject to their being rewritten in independent form is noted with appreciation. The claims have not been so rewritten due to the amendment made to certain of the preceding claims. However these amendments do not change the scope of the claims indicated as being allowable.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2. Therefore claims 2 as well as claim 13 have been canceled and where necessary the dependency of retained claims has been corrected.


Since claim 1 now constitutes claim 2 in independent form and the remaining claims except for claim 15 and those that depend upon it, it is believed only to discuss the rejection of claim 2 rather than that of claim 1.

The Examiner's logic in his rejection based on the combination of Ono et al and Li is understood. However it is submitted that this combination is not suggested by the cited art. Neither reference relates to a selectively operable cogging torque canceling device. Ono et al's cogging torque is always operable. Li, on the other hand relates to an arrangement for varying the output of an electric motor and says not a word about cogging torque reduction. In fact he can not achieve this result because the pole an winding of both armatures is symmetrical. Of course one understanding applicant's invention could practice it by modifying the cited references as the Examiner proposes. But the teaching of the modification must come from the references and no such teaching is there.

The same argument applies to the combination the Examiner has proposed against claims 15 and 16. Here, however, the references are even more remotely related. Varnish discloses nothing more than a brake. As noted above Ono requires staggered armatures to achieve the cogging reduction. Again the Examiner is inadvertently letting applicants disclosure to attempt to lead him to the combination he is proposing.

Therefore the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his reliance on these two rejections.

Respectfully submitted:


Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 717
4821 Pacific Time